

Rt. 3, Frederick, Md. 21701
9/28/74

Dear Nicholas von Hoffman,

when we are indeed in The Year of Our Ford and Dick Nixon did not misrule in vain
why you - in the era of Watergating - come up with doublegoudaspeckducktalk: your
column of 9/21/74.

Specifics:

"The trouble with such propositions [sic] is that while they do punch difficult
to explain holes in officials explanations, they are seldom able to give us much of a
clue as to who the 'real' killer may be." Followed without interruption by

"It is for this reason that nobody has been able to discredit the Warren
Commission report." Still nothing omitted-

"If Lee Harvey Oswald didn't murder Kennedy, then who did?"

All one graf.

The "hypothesis" is not Raznikov's. You have been asleep in the years of raking
in the loot and skinning on the tube. Nor did the solid evidence - and you so describe
it while calling it no more than a "proposition" - await the suit you refer to. That
suit was much later. (The people who develop this kind of evidence are ignored by the
responsible elements of the media and the columnists, while the undergrounders go for
the exploiter huts who subvert, profit and ultimately destroy all credibility, thanks
to those who give them attention and ignore solid work.) I haven't seen Raznikov's
"hypothesis" nor have I investigated that assassination per se but I do have the LAID
belaytype on the destruction of some evidence, a secret transcript of a proceeding in
which only the defendant was not represented and a criminalists proof that there was
more metal than the one gun could have held.

How is it really "the trouble" that this doesn't say "who killed Bobby Kennedy?"

Got nothing to do with the pre-Watergate integrity of public authority? The
state of justice? How politicians can take and hold strong views opposed to govern-
ment policy and not survive them? And what the hell the well-paid reporters on the
profit-making press are doing - and not doing?

"Nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Report?" You dream, man. Most
people never believed it. But it has been destroyed over and over again, save for the
ostriches like you who practice good Orwell. Or is it only since you have become so
big a success. My first book, which was the first on the subject, did that. It has never
been refuted. Bearing the book. And if you think it can be or the Report hasn't been
discredited why don't you have some fun and get such respected types as Albert Jenner,
Charles Shaffer and Howard Willens - I mean in a gangup - to debate their work, mine
or any combination of their choosing in any forum of yours. First gag if they will. If
they do - and they won't - we can work out minor details. They are locals who did the
work bearing Warren's name.

I'll have another in my series on this subject out soon but a freebee to you
will be wasted.

What would you think of a prosecutor's case that consisted of "If ~~Nixon~~
von Hoffman didn't rob the bank who did?" Especially if this Nick were "convicted"
on a combination of suppressed evidence which proved he could not have and ex parte
misrepresentation of the other evidence that consisted of the same plus the nottentest
prejudicial crap?

I don't think that you want to think. Except about being cute, which pays and soothes the ego.

But if you want to be cute while not having to do any real thinking, I refer you to the Post's files on my four Freedom of Information law suits to bring some of this suppressed evidence out.

In the first when I held a press conference and produced xeroxes of evidence proving the kind of Nazi liars Kleindienst and Nixon's then Attorney General were - over their signatures - the Post's reporter filed a column and the Post was over-up. No word. Nor a word when I got a summary judgement against DJ. (This related to the assassination you didn't mention, King's, in which the decision of the 6th circuit, upheld by the Supreme Court, also would have made a column for the before-greatness von Hoffman.)

Let me switch because you are now too important to waste time learning and the Post found this part of that decision, as it found the entire decision, not news:

"...The entire record reeks with ethical moral and professional irregularities, demanding the fullest judicial inquiry...no alternative to the conclusion that Ray's attorneys were more interested in capitalizing on a notorious case..."

Then there is the federal judge who said I should be forever foreclosed from investigating the JFK assassination. This decision is in the Post's files but the words of that great man Danaher were not news. How can the judicial foreclosing of a writer - in perpetuity - be news, or column material?

Would you find it cute enough if an Assistant United States Attorney, when pleading the right to suppress, said it was for law-enforcement purpose, and when asked what law was being enforced, there being none, responded (paraphrase), "Surely when a President is killed there has to be some law, human or natural" and on this was upheld by the sainted Maximus John himself? Then and the forever-foreord janz were upheld by the Burger court and the entire law was with it as administratively and judicially rewritten into a license to suppress. Without a word ~~for~~ the von Hoffman's or the Post's (and a Post reporter was present at every proceeding) and as his first real act as President Open Jerry pulled some dirty-work in conference and nullified the Congressional effort to return the law to its original intent. Yes, the Post knew. And yes, it was not news.

Get with it, man. You didn't begin writing and thinking this kind of b.s and you do owe your readers - especially the young one - something better.

When you can write the kind of graf I've quoted you should stand back and take a long, long look.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg